



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/905,532	07/14/2001	Antony John Rogers	063170.6291	3485
5073	7590	10/22/2008		
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P. 2001 ROSS AVENUE SUITE 600 DALLAS, TX 75201-2980			EXAMINER PYZOCHA, MICHAEL J	
			ART UNIT 2437	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 10/22/2008	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ptomail1@bakerbotts.com  
glenda.orrantia@bakerbotts.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/905,532	<b>Applicant(s)</b> ROGERS ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> MICHAEL PYZOSHA	<b>Art Unit</b> 2437	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 October 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4,8-16 and 20-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4,8-16 and 20-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1, 4, 8-16, and 20-23 are pending.
2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/07/2008 has been entered.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 4, 8-16, 20, 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chess (US 6192512) in view of Nachenberg (US 6851057).

As per claims 1, 10-12, and 14, Chess discloses a method and systems of detecting viral code in subject files, comprising: creating an artificial memory region spanning one or more components of the operating system (see Fig. 2 column 4 lines 49-51); emulating execution of at least a portion of computer executable code in a subject file (see column 4 lines 33-49); monitoring attempts by the emulated computer

executable code to access the artificial memory region; in response to detecting an attempt to access the artificial memory region, determining a source program that is associated with the attempt to access the artificial memory region and determining based on the attempt to access the artificial memory region that the emulated computer executable code is viral (see column 4 lines 49-54).

Chess fails to explicitly disclose the artificial memory region is associated with an export table of a dynamically-linked library; determining an export table entry of the dynamically-linked library that is associated with the attempt to access information and basing a virus determination on this entry.

However, Nachenberg teaches a export table of a dynamically-linked library as an entry point for viruses (see column 5 lines 44-67 and column 6 lines 53-64); and monitoring these entry points (i.e. modified entries of the export table) to determine whether a virus is present (see column 8 lines 6-22 and column 9 lines 47-65).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to monitor export tables of dynamically-linked libraries in the Chess system.

Motivation to do so would have been that the export tables are a known entry point of viruses (see Nachenberg column 6 lines 53-64).

As per claims 4 and 16, the modified Chess and Nachenberg system discloses emulating functionality of the identified operating system call while monitoring the operating system call to determine whether the computer executable code is viral (see Chess column 4 lines 33-54).

As per claims 8, 9, 20 and 23, the modified Chess and Nachenberg system discloses monitoring access by the emulated computer executable code to dynamically linked functions to determine viral activity (see Nachenberg column 5 lines 44-67; column 6 lines 53-64; column 8 lines 6-22 and column 9 lines 47-65).

As per claims 13 and 15, the modified Chess and Nachenberg system discloses a fourth segment comprising auxiliary code, wherein the auxiliary code determines an operating system call that the emulated computer executable code attempted to access; a fifth segment comprising analyzer code, wherein the analyzer code monitors the operating system call to determine whether the computer executable code is viral, while emulation continues (see Chess column 4 lines 33-54).

As per claim 22, the modified Chess and Nachenberg system discloses creating an artificial memory region comprises creating a custom version of an export table with predetermined values for the entry points (see Nachenberg column 5 lines 44-67; column 6 lines 53-64; column 8 lines 6-22 and column 9 lines 47-65).

5. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified Chess and Nachenberg system as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Chambers (US 5398196).

As per claim 21, the modified Chess and Nachenberg system fails to disclose monitoring accesses by the emulated computer executable code to the artificial memory region to detect looping; and determining based on the detection of looping that the emulated computer executable code is viral.

However, Chambers teaches detecting looping to indicate a virus (see Chambers column 10 lines 40-58).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to monitor for looping in the modified Chess and Nachenberg system.

Motivation to do so would have been to prevent viruses from replicating themselves (see Chambers column 10 lines 40-58).

### ***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 4, 8-16, and 20-23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MICHAEL PYZOCHA whose telephone number is (571)272-3875. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 7:00am - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Michael Pyzocha/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2437